

# Auke Bay



## Corridor Study

Auke Bay Corridor Reconnaissance Study  
Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting #5  
Thursday, August 7, 2003  
7:00 to 9:30 p.m.  
Chapel by the Lake, Smith Hall

### NOTES

(Note: CAC Member comments and questions underlined and italicized)

#### **CAC Members present:**

Bill Cole  
Dick Deems  
Steve Ignell  
Gary Jenkins  
Paul Kraft  
Nancy Lehnhart

Pepper McCallon  
Jeff Pilcher  
Tom Satre  
Eric Twelker  
Rick Wolfenberger

#### Members of the public in attendance:

Nathan Bishop (Project Steering Committee)  
Keith Gerken (Project Steering Committee)  
Sam Kito (CBJ)  
Dave Hanna

#### **Project Staff present:**

DOT&PF Southeast Region  
Michael Lukshin, P.E., Project Manager  
David Hawes, Transportation Planner  
Andy Hughes, Planning Chief

#### USKH, Inc.

Lance Mearig, P.E., Project Manager  
Julianne Hanson, P.E., Meeting Facilitator

#### Kinney Engineering

Randy Kinney, P.E., Traffic Engineer

Julianne Hanson presented the evening's agenda and gave a brief synopsis of the work done since the last CAC meeting. Lance Mearig, Randy Kinney and Julianne Hanson then presented the three alternatives. Lance presented data about geometry, intersection control and cross sections, and cost and preliminary ROW impacts. Randy presented information about traffic performance and potential accident reduction of each alternative. Julianne preliminary environmental issues associated with each alternative.

## Public Comment

*Dave Hanna wanted to know why we chose an alignment through his property?\_Mike said that he directed USKH to develop an alternative that provided the best sight distance where Alternative 3 intersects Back Loop Road. He also said that all the alternatives were designed to be cost affordable, looked at the best route regardless of who the property owners were, and that the best location was chosen based on the available engineering information. Mike added that we would further refine Alternative 3 if it were advanced as the preferred alternative.*

## CAC Member Comments

*Were does the seawalk start?*

*Why are Alternative 3 accidents up by six over Alternative 2, but cost is only up by \$2,000?*

*Traffic volumes in front of the lab on Glacier Highway under Alternative 3 are still more than current volumes.*

*What is the length difference between the alternatives?* About one mile.

*What would attract people to use the bypass on Alternative 2?*

*Why cannot some of the components of various alternatives be combined? It is hard to choose between just the three.*

*It is hard to limit to just one, each alternative should address all the issues.* Mike says DOT & PF wants to divest of duplicate routes – help DOT & PF determine their action.

Julianne asked CAC members to rank the alternatives. We gave every CAC member three cards: one card marked with the number “1,” one marked “2,” and the third marked “3.” Julianne instructed the CAC to use the “1” card to indicate their most favored alternative and the “3” card for the least favored. As Julianne called for votes on the alternatives, each member placed a card in front of them to indicate their opinion. We collected the cards and tallied the votes as follows. The alternative with the lowest total score ranked the highest.

	Rank			Total Score
	1	2	3	
Alternative 1	XXXX	XXXX	XXX	21
Alternative 2	XXXX	X	XXXXX	24
Alternative 3	XXX	XXXXXX	XX	21

## CAC Member Comments

*We want another alternative.*

*There is no perfect plan. Maybe the message is - We want it all.*

*Alternative 1 is clearly best. Alternative 2 is a road with no traffic. Alternative 3 is too far off to see any improvement to existing conditions.*

*I am drawn to Alternative 1. I like the aspect of improving the existing road, but I still keep seeing the trucks and buses. We need to get rid of those to make a community. What could Auke Bay become if the traffic was gone and the University and NOAA Lab move nearer to highway, becoming a community place. We need to get the traffic out without all the compromises*

Alternative 2 is good but not great. SE (Region) should start setting aside corridors on government land to eventually move traffic from community areas. We need to reserve the ROW now or we never will get it. Do spot improvements on the existing highway and start putting money toward a new corridor. Make spot improvements compatible with Alternative 3. It is difficult to advance-acquire ROW.

I favor a bypass now as a first step (Alternative 2).

Alternative 2 is my first choice. It seems doable, especially as building block toward Alternative 3. It is unfair to Back Loop residents to defer action now and then come through later.

Just start by reserving government land in the corridor. David Hawes said that corridor preservation is difficult to fund because it is not a formal state process.

CBJ does identify future corridors.

If what Mike says is right, then we should go for Alternative 3 now, but still fix the problems on the existing highway.

Alternative 3 is my preferred corridor – provided we also fix the existing highway.

Is it realistic to build Alternative 3 by 2009? If we are really looking at 2019, then all the problems on the existing highway stay. The last time I was asked to participate on a committee that looked at improving Glacier Highway was 8 years ago. Nothing's been done since. I say we fix the existing problems now (Alternative 1).

I see this as a series of baskets: Basket 1 – fix the immediate needs, Basket 2 – enhance the community of Auke Bay, and Basket 3 – do what is least disruptive to UAS. I am steering more towards Alternative 1, but am not satisfied with any.

We need a combination of the alternatives to address immediate problems and long term needs.

## **Public Comments**

The environmental issues are severely deficient. Alternatives 2 and 3 have much more impact than Alternative 1. Alternative 3 impacts the last wetland on Auke Lake. There are a lot of environmental issues. Three-way intersections are better. Can we stagger the four-ways to make three-ways? I am curious, was there a system to pick out all individual pieces and score them to select a set that makes up the preferred alternative? Mike explained that, yes, we did that. Sixteen segments were presented at the last CAC meeting in May which were then combined into seven concepts.

Nathan Bishop asked the CAC members if it was the CAC wanted the chicken or the egg? Cake and eat it, too? Are we willing to put off a bypass to make improvements in Auke Bay?

We need to prioritize goals to reach a final project down the road. Work on Alternative 3 now. It will take 5 to 10 years to realize. We still need to fix some problems on the existing highway in the interim.

I need to know the priority of improvements.

Can DOT&PF partner with CBJ? DOT & PF works on a bypass, while CBJ works on Alternative 1? Nathan Bishop said it is possible, but we need more information.

Sam Kito said the CBJ's near-term struggle is Riverside Drive, which will suck up money all of the CBJ's available funding until the end of the decade. The CBJ would be willing to take over and maintain the existing Glacier Highway alignment when DOT&PF built a new bypass.

How does Alternative 2 not address safety issues?

Can we restrict access to the existing highway? No trucks or buses.

We could configure the intersections to advantage Alternative 2.

We still have a destination for buses in Auke Bay at the marinas (30+ buses/day at Fisherman's Bend). It is a destination.

I am uncomfortable about the desire by "the bench" to force a choice between alternatives. My interest is an additional alternative based on the CAC conversation tonight. Take Alternative 3 and add priority improvements on Glacier Highway.

Mike Lukshin concluded the meeting with a discussion on what's the next step. He explained the preferred alternative selection process and said DOT&PF's preferred alternative would be presented to the public at the final public meeting. Mike thanked the CAC members for their attendance and participation in the ABCOR project and released them of any further duties. Mike then invited the CAC members to come see and listen to the preferred alternative presentation.

PUBLIC MEETING RE-SCHEDULED TO THURSDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2003. The public meeting will be in Smith Hall at Chapel by the Lake, from 6-9 PM.